

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful and thoughtful examination of the present application. Applicant hereby confirms election of Group I, claims 20-31, as discussed in the telephone conference of June 8, 2007. Claims 20-31 are now pending, and claims 20 and 21 have been amended. Claims 32-48 are canceled. No new matter has been added by way of this Amendment.

Rejection Of Claims 20-31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action mailed June 20, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 20-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and second paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and for being indefinite. The specific rejections made by the Examiner, and Applicant's response to these rejections, are discussed below.

Claim 20

With respect to claim 20, the Examiner has stated that claim 20 "requires that the thickness reserve be in the range of 15% to 40% of the chord and that the greatest profile thickness be in the range of 20% to 45% of the chord. However, it appears that the measurement of the thickness reserve and the greatest profile thickness are identical, and therefore the claim is requiring the same element to be located at two separate points along the chord of the blade." Office Action, p. 3. Applicant respectfully submits that the thickness reserve and the greatest profile thickness are not identical measurements, and that the claim language is in fact clear in light of the specification.

The greatest profile thickness is defined as a greatest **thickness** of the rotor blade "ascertained perpendicularly to the chord," (p. 4, ll. 5-6) and is illustrated in Figure 18 by the line T. In other words, as claimed, the greatest profile thickness (*e.g.*, **the length of line T**) is in the range of 20% to 45% of the length of the rotor blade chord. In contrast, the thickness reserve refers to "the **location** in relation to the blade length where the greatest profile thickness occurs," (p. 4, ll. 2-3) and is illustrated in Figure 18 by the notch TR, which signifies a position along the length of the rotor blade chord. In other words, as claimed, the thickness reserve (*e.g.*, **the**

location/position TR defined along the length of the chord) is in the range of 15% to 40% of the length of the rotor blade chord. Although both measurements are given as ratios with respect to the length of the chord, the greatest profile thickness and the thickness reserve refer to different (though related) physical attributes of the rotor blade and would enable one of skill in the art to construct the rotor blade as claimed without undue experimentation.

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 20-31 is therefore requested. If the Examiner believes that further explanation or clarifying claim language is required, the undersigned Attorney respectfully requests that the Examiner call him.

Claim 21

With respect to claim 21, the Examiner has stated that claim 21 has insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation between 42% and 46%. Applicant has amended this claim language to recite an upper limit of 45%. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is therefore requested.

Rejection of Claims 20, 21, 26, 27 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 20, 21, 26, 27 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,562,420, issued to Tangler *et al.* (“Tangler”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for the rejection and requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

Applicant traverses this rejection because Tangler fails to identically teach every element of the claims as amended. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim).

In particular, claim 20 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that “the rotor blade leading edge has a radius of about 0.146 of a profile depth of the rotor blade in a lower third of the rotor blade adjoining a rotor blade connection.” This amendment is supported by page 10, ll. 1-2, and page 3, ll. 16-18, of the originally filed specification.

Tangler fails to disclose the claimed ratio of the radius of the rotor blade leading edge and a profile depth of the rotor blade. Instead, Tangler’s figures and description describe a

much smaller radius for the rotor blade leading edge. Moreover, it should be noted that rotor blades for wind power installations are tailor-made, and the dimensions of the rotor blades are carefully chosen. A person skilled in the art would therefore not merely change a single feature of the rotor blade described by Tangler, as such a change might lead to unexpected changes in the performance of the entire rotor blade.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 20 as anticipated by Tangler should be withdrawn.

Claims 21-27 and 29-31, which depend from 20, are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons articulated above and because of the additional features recited therein.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Jason T Evans/
Jason T. Evans
Registration No. 57,862

JTE:jrh

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1081708_1.DOC